

REMARKS

Administrative Overview

Claims 20-24, 26-37 and 55-56 were presented for examination. Applicant amends Claims 20 and 26. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 20-24, 26-37 and 55-56 are presented for examination, of which Claim 20 is independent. No new matter has been added by the proposed claim amendments. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0038], [0039], [0043] and [0044] of the Specification as originally filed.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all claims and withdrawal of the objections and rejections, to the extent they are maintained over the claims as amended.

Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to for informalities. Claim 20 has been amended to recite steps (a) through (e) instead of (a), (c), (d), and (e), and to recite the limitation “virtual screen buffer” instead of “virtual frame buffer.” Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the objection to Claim 20 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Mai for taking the time to interview with the Applicant's representatives and for providing the interview summary for the interview. A representative for the Applicant interviewed Examiner Mai, on the phone, on August 25, 2009. During the interview, Claim 20 and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/0047406 to Araujo et al. (“Araujo”) were discussed. No agreement was reached.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-23 and 31-37

Claims 20-23 and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Araujo. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 20-23 and 31-37 as previously presented are patentable over Araujo. However, Applicant hereby amend Claims 20 to more clearly recite the

claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 20 and dependent Claims 21-23 and 31-37 are patentable over Araujo.

Prima facie obviousness is shown only when one or more references, together or alone, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Araujo fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention because Araujo does not teach or suggest transmitting a request periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of a virtual screen buffer changed state, as required by independent Claim 20.

Araujo describes a service enablement platform (SEP) that allows a user to remotely execute any of the user's thin-client applications hosted on an application server after the user logs onto the SEP's web server. *See Araujo*, paragraphs [0084] and [0085]. Rather than generating a static image responsive to a request issued periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of the virtual screen buffer changed state, Araujo merely describes generating an image in conjunction with a client application program. *See Araujo*, paragraph [0120]. Araujo is entirely silent as to what triggers the image generation request. Thus, Araujo fails to teach or suggest generating an image responsive to receiving a request transmitted periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of a virtual screen buffer changed state.

In light of the above-made remarks, Araujo fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, Claim 20 is patentable over Araujo, as are Claims 21-23 and 31-37 which depend on and incorporate the limitations of Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 26, 29, and 30

Claims 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Araujo in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0091738 to Rohrabaugh et al. ("Rohrabaugh.") Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 26, 29, and 30 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Araujo and Rohrabaugh.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 20 is patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 26, 29, and 30 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because

Claims 26, 29, and 30 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claim 20. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Rohrabaugh merely to address applying lossy image compression to application data and transmitting a GIF or JPEG image representing the static image. Like Araujo, Rohrabaugh also fails to teach or suggest transmitting a request periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of a virtual screen buffer changed state. Thus, Rohrabaugh fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 24, 27, and 28

Claims 24, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Araujo in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0055327 to Shaw et al. (“Shaw.”) Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 24, 27, and 28 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Araujo and Shaw.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 20 is patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 24, 27, and 28 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 24, 27, and 28 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claim 20. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Shaw merely to address modifying application data prior to compression by changing the color depth of the data or scaling the data. Like Araujo, Shaw also fails to teach or suggest transmitting a request periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of a virtual screen buffer changed state. Thus, Shaw fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 55 and 56

Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Araujo in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,983,247 to Yamanaka et al. (“Yamanaka.”) Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 55 and 56 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Araujo and Yamanaka.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 20 is patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 55 and 56 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 55 and 56 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claim 20. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Yamanaka merely to address determining an acceptable amount of image loss and compressing the static image according to the determined amount of image loss. Like Araujo, Yamanaka also fails to teach or suggest transmitting a request periodically or upon determining a predetermined percentage of a virtual screen buffer changed state. Thus, Yamanaka fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Conclusion

Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's agent would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: October 13, 2009

/KellanD.Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002